REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed June 4, 2002. In the Office

Action, claims 1-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Traw, et al.

(Traw), U.S. Patent No. 5,949,877). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the §102(b) rejection is improper because the '877

patent did not issue until September 7, 1999, less than one year prior to the February 15, 2000

filing date of the subject application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection

alleged under §102(b) is improper. In the event that the rejection is now contended to constitute

a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in its entirety.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Traw must teach each and every element

of the claims. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is

found either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegall Bros. v.

Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Although the rejection is traversed, Applicants have revised claims 1 and 16 to include

limitations associated with original claim 5.

The Office Action alleges that column 2, lines 48-65 of Traw describes the operation of

"receiving a plurality of revocation lists, where each list corresponds to a given range of host

identifiers." (See page 2 of the Office Action). Applicants respectfully disagree because this

section merely provides definitions for the terms "compliant device" and "device". In column 2,

Traw provides no mention of revocation lists and that each revocation list corresponds to a given

range of host identifiers as set forth in revised claims 1 and 16. Applicants respectfully request

that the Examiner specifically identify where such descriptions are made if the rejection is

maintained.

In addition, Applicants respectfully points out that <u>Traw</u> does not describe the limitations associated with claims (i) 4 & 8, (ii) 9, 12 & 15 and (iii) 13 & 14. More specifically, column 2, lines 5-45 of <u>Traw</u> do not describe the revocation list as being an MPEG private syntax information data structure containing revocation information that is content-specific (claim 4). Instead, this section describes general boilerplate language as to term definitions and other terminology.

With respect to claims 9, 12 and 15, it is alleged that column 8, lines 32-57 of <u>Traw</u> describe a method wherein the copy control is denied to the host by not descrambling the copy control content. Such descriptions are not found in this section of the text. Instead, this section of <u>Traw</u> generally relates to the establishment of a content channel without mention of any descrambling operations.

With respect to claims 13 and 14, Applicants respectfully submit that <u>Traw</u> does not offer any teachings of an axis module being selected from a group consisting of an NRSS-A module, NRSS-B module, Point of Deployment (POD) module and IS07816 smart card, which performs conditional access by not descrambling the copy control content for the host device and the revocation list. Instead, as mentioned above, column 8, lines 32-57 of <u>Traw</u> generally describe the establishment of a content channel in which a message is sent with the randomly generated key which is unique for each stream of content identification of the symmetric cipher to be used and the isochronous channel associated with the content stream.

With respect to claims 16-38, Applicants respectfully traverse the assumption that the same inventive concepts set forth in claims 1-15 are now set forth in claims 16-38. As Examiner is aware, it is clearly evident that independent claim 21 is substantially different from claim 1 in form and in limitations. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the generality of this rejection.

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

1   1.   (Amended) A method for controlling access to copy controlled content to a host

2   device comprising:

3   receiving copy controlled content;

4   receiving a revocation list <u>corresponding to a given range of host identifiers</u>;

5   determining whether a host device associated with an access module is on the revocation

6   list;

7   if the host device is on the revocation list, causing the associated access module to deny

8   the copy controlled content to the host device.

1   2.   The method of claim 1, wherein the revocation list is received in band along with

2   the copy controlled content.

1   3.   The method of claim 1, wherein the revocation list is received out of band of the

2   copy controlled content.

1   4.   The method of claim 1, wherein the revocation list is MPEG private syntax

2   information data structure.

1   5.   (Amended) The method of claim 1, <u>wherein the receiving of the revocation list</u>

2   <u>comprises</u> [further comprising] receiving a plurality of revocation lists, where each list

3   corresponds to a given range of host identifiers.

1   6.   (Amended) The method of claim <u>1</u>[5], <u>wherein prior to determining whether the</u>

2   <u>host device is on the revocation list, the method</u> further comprising reading the revocation list

3   having [a] <u>the</u> range of host identifiers <u>to verify</u> that [bounds the] identifier of the host <u>device</u>

4   associated with the access module <u>is bounded by the range</u>.

1   7.   (Amended) The method of claim 1 further comprising allowing access to the

2   copy controlled content if the host <u>device</u> is not on the revocation list.

1   8.   The method of claim 1, wherein the revocation list contains revocation

2   information that is content specific.

1   9.   The method of claim 1, wherein the copy controlled content is denied to the host

2   device by not descrambling the copy controlled content.

1   10.   The method of claim 1, wherein the host is selected from the group including of a

2   set top box, television, video player, video recorder, hard disk player, hard disk recorder,

3   personal computer, memory stick recorder, minidisk player, minidisk recorder, digital video disk

4   (DVD) player, DVD Recorder, compact disk (CD) player and CD recorder.

1   11.   The method of claim 1, wherein the revocation list is transmitted to devices could

2   to a home network, the home network using a communication medium from one of the group:

3   1394, Universal Serial Bus, Blue Tooth, and Panel Link.

1   12.   The method of claim 1, wherein the access module performs conditional access

2   by not descrambling the copy controlled content for the host device on the revocation list.

1   13.   The method of claim 1, wherein the access module denies the copy controlled

2   content by not outputting the copy controlled content to the host device on the revocation list.

1   14.   The method of claim 12, wherein the access module is selected from the group

2   consisting of an NRSS-A module, NRSS-B module, Point of Deployment (POD) module, and

3   ISO7816 smart card.

1   15.   The method of claim 1, further comprising the access module conditionally

2   descrambling the copy controlled content and authenticating a proper revocation list version

3   number.

1   16.   (Amended) An apparatus for controlling access to copy controlled content to a

2   host device comprising:

080398.P253   -10-   WWS/crr
App. No. 09/504,968   Filed: 2/15/00